

### Review Form 3

Journal Name:	<b>Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</b>
Manuscript Number:	<b>Ms_JEAI_123653</b>
Title of the Manuscript:	<b>Influence of sowing methods and phosphorus levels on Growth, Yield and Economics of Summer Mungbean (<i>Vigna radiata</i> L.)</b>
Type of the Article	

#### **General guidelines for the Peer Review process:**

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

#### **Important Policies Regarding Peer Review**

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

### Review Form 3

#### **PART 1: Review Comments**

<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's Feedback</b> (Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript holds significance for the scientific community, particularly for agronomists and researchers focused on optimizing crop production techniques. By investigating the influence of different sowing methods and phosphorus levels on summer mungbean, it offers valuable insights that can help increase crop yield and improve economic returns for farmers. The detailed analysis of growth characteristics, yield components, and economic parameters makes it a practical contribution to sustainable agricultural practices.	
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This manuscript appears scientifically robust and technically sound due to its clear experimental design and methodology. The use of a Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications ensures statistical rigor and reliability of the results, minimizing variability and allowing for accurate comparisons between treatments. Additionally, the inclusion of specific phosphorus levels and detailed observations on their effects on mungbean growth enhances the scientific merit and relevance of the study.	
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments		
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	<b>YES</b>	
<b>Optional/General</b> comments		

#### **PART 2:**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</b>	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

#### **Reviewer Details:**

Name:	<b>A.K. Jaiswal</b>
Department, University & Country	<b>All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India</b>